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Introduction
The Council of State Governments (CSG) is a region-based organization that fosters the exchange of ideas to help state officials shape public policy.
We are a national nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that combines the power of a membership association, serving state officials in all three branches of government, with policy and research expertise to develop strategies that increase public safety and strengthen communities.

How We Work

- We bring people together.
- We drive the criminal justice field forward with original research.
- We build momentum for policy change.
- We provide expert assistance.

Our Goals

- Break the cycle of incarceration.
- Advance health, opportunity, and equity.
- Use data to improve safety and justice.
The CSG Justice Center assists state and local jurisdictions on a wide range of public safety topics.

Stepping Up is a national initiative calling on counties across the country to reduce the prevalence of people with mental illnesses and co-occurring substance addictions being held in county jails.

JMHCP facilitates collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, and mental health and substance use treatment systems to better serve people with mental illnesses and to increase public safety.

IOYouth helps states align their policies, practices, and resource allocation with what research shows works to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth while enhancing public safety.
A data-driven approach to improve public safety, reduce corrections and related criminal justice spending, and reinvest savings in strategies that can decrease crime and reduce recidivism.

The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and The Pew Charitable Trusts.
The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is a process that includes analysis, policy development, implementation, and sustainability.

**Phase I**
- Bipartisan, Interbranch Working Group
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Data Analysis
- Policy Option Development

**Phase II**
- Policy Implementation
- Monitoring Through Data
Over the past 15 years, the CSG Justice Center has helped 33 states control corrections spending and reinvest in strategies to increase public safety.

States That Have Used a Justice Reinvestment Approach with Assistance from The Council of State Governments Justice Center*

27 PAST STATES

5 CURRENT STATES

1 LIMITED ENGAGEMENT

Strengthening responses to supervision violations and the use of evidence-based practices

Concentrating supervision resources on individuals at the highest risk to reoffend

Identifying effective ways to use funding to improve community supervision

Strengthening gender-response approaches to supervision

Providing judges with more tools to determine probation term lengths

*40 states have pursued a Justice Reinvestment (JR) approach with technical assistance from the CSG Justice Center, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Crime and Justice Institute, or the Vera Institute of Justice. Impacts relate to states that the CSG Justice Center has worked with on JR.
Minnesota’s state leaders requested support from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance and The Pew Charitable Trusts to utilize the Justice Reinvestment Initiative.

This initiative is supported by counties and all three branches of state government to seek criminal justice system improvements.

- Governor Tim Walz
- Chief Justice Lorie Skjerven Gildea
- Speaker of the House Melissa Hortman
- Senate Majority Leader Paul Gazelka
- Senator Julie A. Rosen, Chair of the Senate Finance Committee
- Association of Minnesota Counties President, Rich Sve
As part of their request for the Justice Reinvestment Initiative, state leaders outlined specific challenges and areas of analysis to be explored through the process.

**Scope of Work**

- Review corrections and community supervision spending in Minnesota.
- Analyze resources across the three community supervision delivery systems.
- Coordinate resources across community supervision, victim services, the judiciary, and corrections.
- Analyze population-based model for funding the DOC and impact on county partners and public safety.
- Advance sustainability of Minnesota’s corrections system and improve service delivery effectiveness.
- Ensure the equitable distribution of criminal justice system investments by both individual and location.
The Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment launches today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Reese</td>
<td>Founder &amp; Executive Director, Until We Are All Free</td>
<td>District 66</td>
<td>District 65A</td>
<td>District 30A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Julie Rosen</td>
<td>Chair, Finance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. John Marty</td>
<td>District 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. John Marty</td>
<td>District 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Rena Moran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Paul Novotny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. John Marty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Paul Novotny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Paul Novotny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schnell</td>
<td>DOC Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>MACCAC President, Hennepin County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Anderson</td>
<td>CPO President, Itasca County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Choi</td>
<td>Board Member, MN County Attorneys Association, Ramsey County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mitchell</td>
<td>Chair, MN Sentencing Guidelines Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Swanson</td>
<td>AMC Public Safety Chair, Roseau County Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Yohuru Williams</td>
<td>Founding Director, Racial Justice Initiative, UST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Jennifer Frisch</td>
<td>MN Court of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Kevin DuPuis</td>
<td>Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Leslie</td>
<td>Dakota County Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Delivery System Working Group, established in HF 63 and composed largely of local practitioners, launched in September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>Paul Schnell</th>
<th>Chris Dodge</th>
<th>Safia Khan</th>
<th>Curtis Shanklin</th>
<th>Al Godfrey</th>
<th>Dayna Burmeister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOC Commissioner</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer, DOC</td>
<td>Director of Government &amp; External Relations, DOC</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, DOC</td>
<td>Field Services Director, DOC</td>
<td>Manager Southern Region, DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>Midge Christianson</td>
<td>Nicole Kern</td>
<td>Tami Jo Lieberg</td>
<td>Dylan Warkentin</td>
<td>Carl Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hennepin County Community Corrections Director</td>
<td>Region 6W Community Corrections Director</td>
<td>Morrison County Community Corrections Director</td>
<td>Kandiyohi County Community Corrections Director</td>
<td>Anoka County Community Corrections Director</td>
<td>AMC Public Safety Policy Analyst, MACCAC Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Jason Anderson</td>
<td>Terry Fawcett</td>
<td>Mike MacMillian</td>
<td>Stephen King</td>
<td>Jim Schneider</td>
<td>Les Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itasca County Probation Director</td>
<td>Pine County Probation Director</td>
<td>Wright County Probation Director</td>
<td>Mower County Probation Director</td>
<td>Cass County Probation Director</td>
<td>Brown County Probation Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Comm'r</td>
<td>Jack Swanson</td>
<td>Jeff Lunde</td>
<td>Kurt Mortenson</td>
<td>Barb Weckman Brekke</td>
<td>Ron Antony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roseau County Commissioner</td>
<td>Hennepin County Commissioner</td>
<td>Otter Tail County Commissioner</td>
<td>Scott County Commissioner</td>
<td>Yellow Medicine County Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts Tribes</td>
<td>Jeff Shorba</td>
<td>Janet Marshall</td>
<td>Kristen Trebil</td>
<td>Kenneth Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Court Administrator</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Liaison</td>
<td>Court Services Director</td>
<td>Chief, Leech Lake Tribal Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims BH</td>
<td>Kate Weeks</td>
<td>Bobbi Holtberg</td>
<td>Nicole Matthews</td>
<td>Sue Abderholden</td>
<td>Clinton Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs</td>
<td>Minnesota Alliance on Crime Executive Director</td>
<td>Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition</td>
<td>NAMI Executive Director</td>
<td>Director of Behavioral Health White Earth Reservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HF 63 asked the Delivery System Working Group to “describe how the state and counties can achieve an effective supervision system together, balancing local control with state support and collaboration.”

1. A proposal for sustainable funding of the state’s community supervision delivery systems
   • Recommended funding model and the associated costs
   • Alternative funding and delivery models
   • Mechanisms to ensure balanced application of increases in the cost of community supervision services

2. Definition of core standards in accordance with the state’s obligation to fund or provide supervision services that are
   • Geographically equitable
   • Reflect modern correctional practice

3. A plan for tribal government supervision of people on probation or post-release supervision
Each group has slightly different roles and responsibilities, and both are vital to the success of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment</th>
<th>Delivery System Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides strategic direction in the development of policy recommendations</td>
<td>• Assesses the various community supervision models operating in the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates momentum for adoption of policy recommendations</td>
<td>• Defines base-level supervision standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approves the Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy package</td>
<td>• Identifies a balanced and sustainable funding model for Minnesota’s community supervision system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishes a pathway for tribal governments to supervise people on probation and supervised release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota’s Justice Reinvestment Initiative focuses on the back end of the criminal justice system.
**Types of Community Supervision**

**Probation:** A community supervision sanction imposed on a person by the court as an alternative to or in conjunction with confinement. The person may be convicted of felony, gross misdemeanor, or misdemeanor offenses.

**Supervised release:** Community supervision for people who committed felony offenses and are released from prison. In Minnesota, state law requires most people to serve two-thirds of their executed sentence in prison and one-third in the community under supervision. Some people who require greater supervision are placed on intensive supervised release.

Minnesota’s community supervision system is unusual in that counties can choose between three options.

Minnesota Counties by Probation Delivery System and Judicial District, 2021

- Community Corrections Act (CCA) agencies provide all probation services
- Department of Corrections (DOC) provides all probation services
- County Probation Officer (CPO) provide services for juveniles/adult non-felonies, while the DOC provides probation services for adult felonies

Judges in 7 of 10 judicial districts encounter two or three supervision systems.

Minnesota Department of Corrections, Fact Sheet: Correctional Delivery Systems (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Corrections, July 2021).
Minnesota is one of 12 states where the state is not solely responsible for operating probation.

At both the state and county levels, probation systems are housed in either the executive or judicial branch.

Although Minnesota has a low incarceration rate, its probation rate is among the highest in the country at 2,427 adults per 100,000.

Minnesota’s adult probation rate was the sixth highest in the country in 2019, with 1 in every 50 adults on probation.

The data presented here are the most recently available and were collected in 2019. Minnesota’s probation rate may have changed in 2020.

Other states with low incarceration rates, such as Massachusetts and Maine, maintain lower probation rates—42nd and 48th, respectively.

The data presented here are the most recently available and were collected in 2019. Minnesota’s probation rate may have changed in 2020.

Although Minnesota has a low incarceration rate, its probation rate is among the highest in the country. Minnesota’s rate of people under correctional control is 11th highest among states.

- **Probation Rate, 2019**: Minnesota has the 6th highest rate of people on probation.
- **Incarceration Rate, 2019**: Minnesota has the 5th lowest rate of people incarcerated.
- **Total Correctional Control, 2019**: Minnesota has the 11th highest rate of people under correctional control.

Minnesota’s correctional populations are concentrated in the community, not in prison or jail; this sentencing system demands high-quality supervision.

Population Under Correctional Control, Dec 31, 2019

- Felony Probation: 45,384
- Gross Misdemeanor Probation: 32,495
- Misdemeanor Probation: 20,511
- Prison: 9,381
- Supervised Release: 7,566
- Jail: 6,519

Todd D. Minton, Lauren G. Beatty, and Zhen Zeng, Ph.D., Correctional Populations in the United States, 2019 – Statistical Tables (Washington, D.C.: Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics, July 2021); Minnesota Department of Corrections, Adult Prison Population Summary (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Corrections, January 2020); Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2019 Probation Survey (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Corrections, April 2020); CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Black and Native American people are over-represented in probation, supervised release, and prison populations.

Racial Composition of Justice-Involved Populations Compared to Total Adult Population

- **Total Adult**: 85%
- **Probation**: 64% (White), 18% (Black), 6% (Native American), 5% (Asian)
- **Supervised Release**: 62% (White), 27% (Black), 8% (Native American), 3% (Asian)
- **Prison**: 51% (White), 38% (Black), 8% (Native American), 3% (Asian)

Sentences to probation make up about three-quarters of all felony sentences.

Number of People Sentenced to Probation or Prison by Year Sentenced, 2004–2019

Hispanic, Native American, and Black people receive sentences to prison more often than White or Asian people.

**Sentences to Probation and Prison by Race and Ethnicity, 2017–2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Stay of Imposition (%)</th>
<th>Stay of Execution (%)</th>
<th>Prison (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission data.
More than 60 percent of admissions to prison are due to supervision failures.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC prison admissions data.
A larger percentage of Native American prison admissions are due to supervision failures compared to people of other races.

**Prison Admissions by Commitment Type and Race, 2017–2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>New Commitment</th>
<th>Release Revocation - No New Offense</th>
<th>Probation Revocation</th>
<th>Release Revocation - New Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC prison admissions data.
More than 40 percent of prison admissions of women are due to probation revocations.

Prison Admissions by Commitment Type and Gender, 2017–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Commitment</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Revocation - No New Offense</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revocation</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Revocation - New Offense</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC prison admissions data.
Less than 10 percent of people are released from prison without a form of supervision.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC prison release data.
Minnesota’s total adult probation population has declined, but the felony probation population has remained consistent.
Over 80 percent of adults on probation are supervised by local agencies; for felony cases it is almost three-quarters.

Minnesota Probation Population by Delivery System, 2020

Total Adult Probation Population
N = 85,254

- DOC: 11%
- CPO: 71%
- CCA: 18%

Felony Probation Population
N = 41,664

- DOC: 27%
- CCA: 73%
The composition of probation populations varies across types of supervision agencies.

### Probation Type for Five Largest Probation Organizations in Minnesota, 2020

- **Hennepin County CC**: 16,315
- **MN DOC**: 15,596
- **Ramsey County CC**: 8,525
- **Anoka County CC**: 5,681
- **Dakota County CC**: 5,416

### Type of Offense for People on Probation by Agency Type, 2020

- **CCA**
  - Violent: 12%
  - Property: 13%
  - Drug: 35%
  - DWI: 9%
  - Family: 12%
  - Other (including Traffic): 15%
  - Total: N = 60,660

- **DOC**
  - Violent: 15%
  - Property: 16%
  - Drug: 29%
  - DWI: 18%
  - Family: 10%
  - Other (including Traffic): 8%
  - Total: N = 15,696

- **CPO**
  - Violent: 4%
  - Property: 8%
  - Drug: 10%
  - DWI: 21%
  - Family: 12%
  - Other (including Traffic): 13%
  - Total: N = 8,998

*Minnesota Department of Corrections Probation Survey, 2020.*
The racial makeup of the three delivery systems also differs, and supervision staff may need different cultural competencies to deliver appropriate services.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
1. Although Minnesota has a low incarceration rate, its probation rate is the 6th highest in the country; Minnesota’s rate of people under correctional control is 11th highest among states.

2. Sentences to probation make up about three-quarters of all felony sentences; this sentencing system demands high-quality supervision.

3. Black and Native American people are overrepresented in Minnesota’s criminal justice system.

4. More than 60 percent of admissions to prison are due to supervision failures.

5. Over 80 percent of adults on probation are supervised by local agencies, and for felony cases it is almost three-quarters.
In 2020, Minnesota spent the lowest proportion of state general funds on corrections.

All states average 6.5 percent of general fund state spending on corrections.

Corrections spending has increased, and the state has prioritized spending on prisons.

DOC Budget, 2015–2021

- Prisons: $376,983 to $426,867 (13% increase)
- Community Services: $116,654 to $130,218 (12% increase)
- Operation Support: $23,806 to $28,058 (18% increase)

Total: $517,443 to $585,143 (13% increase) to $624,604 (8% increase)

Email correspondence between CSG Justice Center and MN DOC, January 2021.
Public Safety & Judiciary (PSJ) receives about $3.2 billion, or 3 percent of the state’s budget, and Corrections is 42 percent of PSJ.

Minnesota State Budget FY2022–2023

Public Safety & Judiciary $3,190,000,000 3%

Public Safety & Judiciary Budget FY2022–2023

Department of Corrections $1,314,000,000 42%

District Courts 22%

Supreme Court 5%

Board of Public Defense 7%

Other 4%

Public Safety 20%

Corrections Budget FY2022–2023

Incarceration and Pre-Release Services $137,780,000 22%

Community Supervision and Post-Release Services 73%

Organizational, Regulatory and Administrative Services 5%

Probation and supervised release total 22 percent of the DOC Supervision budget. County grants and subsidies are 58 percent of the Supervision budget.

As of July 2021:

• 22 CCA agencies served 35 counties.
• CPO agencies served 23 counties.
• DOC provides adult felony probation and supervised release supervision in the 52 counties (23 of which they share with CPO).

Annual Funding for Community Supervision, FY2022–2023

- Probation & Supervised Release (DOC) 22%
- Pass-through Grants & Subsidies to CPO and CCA 58%
- Other 20%

State probation funding subsidies and grants to counties involve seven funding streams.

FY2020 DOC Funding Streams

1. CCA Subsidy $61,006,999
2. Alternative to Incarceration Grant $160,000
3. Reentry HWH Grant $300,000
4. Intensive Supervision ISR Grant $3,869,000
5a. REAM Grant $417,500
5b. REAM Grant $185,500
6. CL/WL Reduction Grant $1,314,812
7. CPO Reimbursement $5,043,000

Communication from MN DOC to the CSG Justice Center on 10/08/2021.
State auditor reports that county expenditures for public safety in 2019 totaled $1.3 billion, or 16.6 percent of total county expenditures.

Summary of County Expenditures, 2019

- Public Safety: 83% ($1,341,661,606)
- Sheriff: 47%
- Corrections: 42%
- All Other: 7%
- Capital Outlay: 4%

Public Safety Expenditures, 2019

These are critiques we have heard about the delivery systems and funding approaches.

- Too complex
- No definition of risk or workload
- Outcomes, innovations, and efficiencies are not considered or encouraged
- Does not account for variances in sentencing practice
- 99% of the CCA aid distribution is determined by the population variable
- Easier to shift costs with multiple sources of funding
- Not based on what probation officers do
- Different formulas for funding for people convicted of sex offenses, intensive supervised release, and caseload reduction
- Funding per capita varies less in CCA counties compared to non-CCA counties

The state has a long history of tinkering with supervision systems in statute.

- Amendments to delivery of supervision
- Differentiating county choices by population
- A penchant for complexity:
  - Three different models
- Details of the CCA formula (§ 401.10)
- Multiple statutes and case law on revocation

History of 37 Amendments to § 244.19

- 2020
- 2000
- 1980
- 1960
- 1940
- 1920
- 1917 c 397 s 9
- 1985 c 9 art 2 s 76
- 1985 c 220 s 5,6
- 1983 c 274 s 18
- 1981 c 192 s 20
- 1980 c 617 s 47
- 1959 c 698 s 3
- 1945 c 517 s 4
- 1977 c 392 s 8
- 1977 c 281 s 1-3
- 1976 c 163 s 58
- 1975 c 381 s 21
- 1975 c 271 s 6
- 1975 c 258 s 5
- 1973 c 654 s 15
- 1973 c 507 s 45
- 1973 c 492 s 14
- 1971 c 951 s 41-43
- 1971 c 25 s 51
- 1969 c 399 s 1
- 1969 c 278 s 1
- 1965 c 697 s 1
- 1965 c 316 s 7-11
- 1963 c 694 s 1
- 1961 c 430 s 2-4
- 1933 c 204 s 1
- 1998 c 367 art 7 s 2,15
- 1998 c 408 s 10
- 1997 c 239 art 9 s 32,51
- 1996 c 408 art 8 s 8
- 1992 c 571 art 11 s 10
- 1988 c 505 s 1-4
- 1987 c 252 s 8
- 1986 c 444
- 1977 c 392 s 8
- 2009 c 101 art 2 s 109
- 2008 c 204 s 42
- 2003 c 112 art 2 s 31
- 1977 c 281 s 1-3
- 1976 c 163 s 58
- 1975 c 381 s 21
- 1975 c 271 s 6
- 1975 c 258 s 5
- 1973 c 654 s 15
- 1973 c 507 s 45
- 1973 c 492 s 14
- 1971 c 951 s 41-43
- 1971 c 25 s 51
- 1969 c 399 s 1
- 1969 c 278 s 1
- 1965 c 697 s 1
- 1965 c 316 s 7-11
- 1963 c 694 s 1
- 1961 c 430 s 2-4
- 1933 c 204 s 1
- 1998 c 408 s 10
- 1997 c 239 art 9 s 32,51
- 1996 c 408 art 8 s 8
- 1992 c 571 art 11 s 10
- 1988 c 505 s 1-4
- 1987 c 252 s 8
- 1986 c 444
In the 1990s, Minnesota repeatedly studied its supervision systems and funding, putting a lot of time, energy, and resources into improving its system.

- 1993—Minnesota Probation: A System in Crisis
- 1994—Probation in Minnesota: Putting the Pieces Together
- 1995—Fair and Equitable: a new community corrections formula
- 1996—Funding for Probation Services
- 1997—Distribution Formula: Probation Caseload Reduction Funding
States use different forms to fund community corrections.

Some states (e.g., California, Arizona, Illinois, and Arkansas) tie funding to reducing revocations from probation to prison, referred to as “performance incentive funding” or “PIF.”

Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Oregon all use a funding formula to compare counties and share funding across county or multi-county probation departments.

Other states use sentencing guidelines, or risk assessment, or both to define a target population and tie funding to programs serving that population (e.g., Kansas and Michigan).

Key Takeaways

1. In 2020, Minnesota spent the lowest proportion of state general funds on corrections.

2. Corrections spending has increased, and the state has prioritized spending on prisons.

3. For many years, the state has put a lot of time, energy, and resources into improving its delivery systems and funding approaches.
How does community supervision in Minnesota currently hold up against these three principles?

1. **Effectiveness**  
   Is the Minnesota approach working?  
   Are people succeeding?

2. **Equity**  
   Is the Minnesota approach fair?  
   Does every person get equal opportunities to succeed?

3. **Resources**  
   Is Minnesota supervision funded in a way to ensure it is effective and equitable?
State and local stakeholders are participating in several engagement activities as part of the Minnesota Justice Reinvestment Initiative.

**Data Analysis**
Exploring sentencing, prison, probation, and supervised release data from MN Sentencing Guidelines Commission and MN Department of Corrections (S³)

**Stakeholder Engagement**
Managing process and communications, ensuring inclusion of voices

**Supervision Assessment**
Interviewing staff and people on probation from 4–5 agencies from each delivery system (13 total)

**Policy and Funding Assessment**
Focusing on statutes, judicial policy, budgets, appropriations
# Calendar of meetings and deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 28</td>
<td>First Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>Second Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>Third Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 10</td>
<td>State of Oregon Peer Sharing on Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 16</td>
<td>Fourth Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>Juvenile Data Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7</td>
<td>Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11-12</td>
<td>Virtual Behavioral Health Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td>Final Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 21</td>
<td>Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1</td>
<td>Report Due to Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota’s Justice Reinvestment Initiative will run through 2022.

**2021**
- **Project Launch**
  - September 2021
- **September - December 2021**
  - CSG Justice Center staff conduct independent data analysis and extensive stakeholder engagement, facilitate working group meetings, and develop policy recommendations.

**2022**
- **January 2022**
  - Summary report of Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations released
- **February 2022**
  - Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations are introduced
- **Spring 2022**
  - Ongoing technical assistance and data monitoring to ensure the policy recommendations are successfully implemented
- **2022**
  - Minnesota's 2022 legislative session begins
  - Justice Reinvestment Initiative implementation can begin
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Thank You!

Join our distribution list to receive updates and announcements:

https://csgjusticecenter.org/resources/newsletters/

For more information, please contact Michelle Rodriguez at mrodriguez@csg.org
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